

THE HONORABLE JOHN C. COUGHENOUR

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
  
Plaintiff,  
  
v.  
  
SUMIT GARG,  
  
Defendant.

CASE NO. CR21-0045-JCC  
  
ORDER

This matter comes before the Court on Defendant's motion for reconsideration (Dkt. No. 782) of this Court's order denying Defendant's request to compel discovery. (Dkt. No. 710.) Having thoroughly considered the relevant record, the Court hereby DENIES Defendant's motion for the reasons explained herein.

Under the Local Criminal Rules, "[m]otions for reconsideration are disfavored." CrR12(b)(13)(A). "The Court will ordinarily deny such motions in the absence of a showing of manifest error in the prior ruling or a showing of new facts or legal authority which could not have been brought to its attention earlier with reasonable diligence." *Id.* "A motion for reconsideration should not be used to ask the court to rethink what the court had already thought through—rightly or wrongly." *Ma v. Univ. of S. California*, 2019 WL 1239269, slip op. at 1 (W.D. Wash. 2019).

1 Here, Defendant asks the Court to reconsider its ruling denying his motion to compel  
2 evidence. (Dkt. No. 782.) In that motion, Defendant sought forensic tools.<sup>1</sup> (Dkt. No. 652.)  
3 Defendant fails to demonstrate manifest error in the prior ruling or a showing of new facts or  
4 legal authority, as required by LCR 7(h)(1). Instead, Defendant bemoans the Court's reasoning,  
5 or otherwise calls into question the Court's impartiality. But this Court will not reconsider  
6 arguments that the Court has rejected.

7 Accordingly, Defendant's motion for reconsideration (Dkt. No. 782) is DENIED.  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12

13 DATED this 13th day of February 2024.

14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "John C. Coughenour", written over a horizontal line.

John C. Coughenour  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

---

25 <sup>1</sup> The Court denied Defendant's request for video editing software among other forensic tools  
26 because of the security concerns posed by affording Defendant unfettered access to such  
technology in light of the underlying charges. (*See generally* Dkt. No. 710.)